

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
9  
10 JEFFREY KEVIN GOMEZ, ) No. C 05-2436 MMC (PR)  
11 Plaintiff, )  
12 v. ) **ORDER OF DISMISSAL; DENYING  
13 JEANNE S. WOODFORED, et al., ) APPLICATION TO PROCEED IN  
14 Defendants. ) FORMA PAUPERIS**  
15 \_\_\_\_\_ ) (Docket Nos. 2)  
16 -  
17

18 Plaintiff Keith Candler, a California prisoner proceeding pro se, filed the above-  
19 titled civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff alleges he was disciplined  
20 by prison officials for violating prison rules, in a manner that violated his constitutional  
rights; he further alleges that part of his punishment for the violation was the loss of 360  
days of good time credits. He seeks restoration of those credits.

21 A federal court must conduct a preliminary screening in any case in which a prisoner  
22 seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity.  
23 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). In its review, the court must identify any cognizable claims and  
24 dismiss any claims that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim upon which relief may  
25 be granted or seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. See  
26 id. § 1915A(b)(1), (2). Pro se pleadings must, however, be liberally construed. See  
27 Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1988).

28 Here, plaintiff challenges the validity of a decision by prison officials that he was

**United States District Court**

For the Northern District of California

1 guilty of violating a prison rule, which decision resulted in his loss of good time credits.  
2 The Supreme Court has consistently held that any claim by a prisoner attacking the fact or  
3 duration of his confinement must be brought by way of a petition for a writ of habeas  
4 corpus. See Calderon v. Ashmus, 523 U.S. 740, 747 (1998); Edwards v. Balisok, 520 U.S.  
5 641, 648 (1997); Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475, 500 (1973). In particular, a prisoner  
6 must file a habeas petition if the nature of his claim is such that it may result in his  
7 entitlement to an earlier release, such as a claim for violation of rights in connection with  
8 the loss of good time credits. See Young v. Kenny, 907 F.2d 874, 876-78 (9th Cir. 1990).  
9 A civil rights complaint seeking habeas relief is subject to dismissal without prejudice to  
10 the prisoner's bringing his claim in a petition for a writ of habeas corpus. See Trimble v.  
11 City of Santa Rosa, 49 F.3d 583, 586 (9th Cir. 1995).

12 Accordingly, the instant complaint is DISMISSED, without prejudice to plaintiff's  
13 refiling his claims in a petition for a writ of habeas corpus after he has exhausted those  
14 claims in the state courts. In light of the dismissal, the application to proceed in forma  
15 pauperis is DENIED. No fee is due.

16 This order terminates Docket No. 2.

17 The Clerk shall close the file.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 DATED: October 14, 2005

20   
21 MAKINE M. CHESNEY  
United States District Judge

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28